THE ROMISH DOCTRINE OF Tranſubſtantiation Impartially Conſidered:

OR

A Plain, Rational, and Scriptural DEFENCE of the *Proteſtant* DOCTRINE of the *Euchariſt*; wherein all the Subtilties of the *Romiſh Church*, which relate to the Argument, are duly examined and fully confuted,

By *R. CORNTHWAITE.*

Prove all things; hold faſt that which is good, 1 Theſ. v. 21.

LONDON:

Printed for JOHN NOON, at the *White Hart* in *Cheapſide*, near *Mercers-chapel*; and A. DODD, without *Temple-Bar*. 1732.

Price Six-pence.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE PREFACE.

HAD the following tract been originally designed for the press, it might as well have appeared in publick, near four years ago, as now; because all the materials were then entirely collected, at the request, and for the satisfaction of a gentleman, a particular friend, (whom I have leave to mention in this affair, by no other name) who first put a printed piece on Transubstantiation into my hands, with a

desire to give him my thoughts, in writing, on it, which I did, and not long after received an answer, to which I replied, and there the affair ended. I confess, I was not then *without the pressing sollicitations of several ingenious friends, to make the matter publick; but, as I never imagined such sollicitations (abstracted from the considerations of the present necessity and probable usefulness of a treatise) a sufficient apology for the publication of even the most ingenious performances, I was not willing, to put either myself or the world, to what, I was afraid, might perhaps be too justly accounted an unnecessary charge, and so the affair lay dormant till about a month ago; when a very judicious friend, having perused the several papers which had passed on both sides, kindly attack'd me with a friendly warmth, being of opinion, (as he was pleas'd to express himself) that I should not without some difficulty be able to justify my conduct in keeping so private, what in all probability, might be of considerable advantage to the publick. His approbation was of itself, I confess, of very great weight with me, but became altogether irresistible, by the additional motive of publick advantage, (whereof he thought I might reasonably entertain consi-*

derable

derable hopes) and by the prevalence of ſome other arguments, which left me entirely inexcuſable, if I ungenerouſly refuſed to comply with his unexpected requeſt. Upon this I conſidered with myſelf, what method might be moſt proper to be perſued in the intended publication.

The chief ſubject of the controverſy was Tranſubſtantiation, *but in perſuing that argument, ſome other things, not at all belonging thereto, had accidentally interven'd, which, with the repetitions neceſſarily occaſioned by anſwers and replies, would, I imagined, only enhance the price, (which is rarely any advantage to the ſpread of truth) without throwing the leaſt light into the controverſy. I thought it therefore might be moſt adviſeable to collect into as narrow a compaſs as I well could, all that had paſs'd between my unknown antagoniſts † and me, on the ſubject of* Tranſubſtantiation, *which I have endeavoured to do with the utmoſt exactneſs and impartiality, without either adding the leaſt ſtrength to my own reaſoning, or repreſenting the arguments of my opponents under the leaſt diſadvantage. Nay, the rea-*

† *Two perſons were confeſſedly concerned in the anſwer.*

ſoning

ſoning part is, generally ſpeaking, the ſame even word for word, as well as in the very ſame order; nor is there ſcarcely ſo much as a verbal alteration, but what the retrenching of that which was foreign to the argument of Tranſubſtantiation, *and the conſequent different connexion of that which followed, muſt neceſſarily occaſion with regard to the joining words; neither has any one of thoſe alterations,* to my knowledge, *even the leaſt influence upon the argumentative part. However, the papers, from which the enſuing treatiſe was extracted, are not only in my hands, but alſo in the hands of thoſe perſons, whoſe intereſt it is (and who therefore, we have reaſon to ſuppoſe will hardly fail) to point out any conſiderable miſtake, which, they may imagin, I have made; either with regard to the repreſentation of the affair, or the concluſiveneſs of the reaſoning; and, as I have no room to expect any favor, ſo neither do I perceive in myſelf the leaſt inclination to deſire any, in the way of argument, being willing to hear whatever can be advanced, on this or any other topic, from* ſcripture *and* reaſon, *the two* only *fountains of all my religious ſentiments; being ſenſible that it is my duty, as a chriſtian,* to prove all things and hold faſt that which is good.

What

What I have farther to add, by way of preface is this, that, (upon enquiry, in the way of converſation) the preſent publication of the enſuing treatiſe is, I perceive, apprehended, by many, not to be ſo unſeaſonable or unneceſſary, as I had imagined; the diligence *of the* Romiſh *emiſſarys being in their opinion ſtill as* remarkably great *as ever, and their* ſucceſs, *even at preſent, too conſiderable to be entirely diſregarded. And, indeed, if we may form a judgment of their future management, from the conſtant, invariable practice of paſt ages, an aſſiduous application to the propagating what they profeſs to believe to be truth, is always to be firmly expected from thoſe of the* Romiſh *communion; whoſe unwearied zeal in this reſpect, were it but duly tempered with the meek and tender ſpirit of the humble and the compaſſionate* Jeſus *could never be ſufficiently extolled, and deſerves,* at leaſt, *to be earneſtly recommended as worthy the ſtricteſt imitation of all* Chriſtians, *who have* wiſely *learnt, never to ſeparate, on any account whatſoever, the two excellent virtues,* knowledge *and* charity *from the laudable exerciſe thereof. To conclude, if the following piece be in any meaſure ſerviceable, to confirm the wavering, or reclaim the ſtraying ſoul to the knowledge and practiſe*

tiſe of the truth (therein contended for) as it is in Jeſus, *my labor will be amply rewarded, and my end fully anſwered; and, if my honeſt endeavours therein ſhould not be attended with any conſiderable ſucceſs, yet I ſhall have this* my *rejoicing, the teſtimony of my conſcience that I have aimed well.*

ERRATUM.

PAGE 5. l. 6. put the Parentheſis after *other*, and dele it after *cavil.*

THE

THE

Romiſh Doctrine

OF

Tranſubſtantiation

Impartially Conſidered.

IN order to do juſtice to the preſent argument, it will be proper to premiſe the two different expoſitions of the words of the inſtitution of the Lord's ſupper (as recorded by the evangeliſts, and by St. Paul in his 1ſt epiſtle to the Corinthians) propoſed to be conſidered in the enſuing treatiſe, which are as follow.

The generality of *Proteſtants* underſtand no more by theſe words, *This is my Body, &c.* And, *This Cup is the New Teſtament in my Blood, &c.* than that our Savior deſign-

ed, that the bread and wine uſed in this ordinance, at its firſt inſtitution, ſhould be eaten and drunken, after his having firſt given thanks to God for them, *in commemoration of his body and blood* which were ſhortly to be broken and ſhed. The *Romaniſts*, on the other hand, imagin, *that the broken body and ſhed blood of our bleſſed Savior*; or, at leaſt, *that his body and blood ſhortly to be broken and ſhed*, were ordered by him, in theſe words, to be eaten and drunken, under the appearances of bread and wine.

Now that neither of theſe two laſt ſenſes can be the meaning of our bleſſed Savior, in theſe expreſſions, will, I think, evidently appear in the following lines.

That he could not order his diſciples to eat his broken body and drink his ſhed blood under the appearances of bread and wine, at the inſtitution of his ſupper, is plain from hence, *namely*, becauſe the thing was in its own nature impracticable. Our Savior's body was not then broken, nor his blood ſhed, when he ſpake theſe words, they could not therefore be eaten and drunken, as broken and ſhed. For omnipotence itſelf, *with reverence be it ſpoken*, cannot poſſibly make one and the ſame thing to be and not be at the ſame time; if Chriſt's body and blood were not then broken and ſhed, it was impoſſible in the nature of things, that his ſaying that the broken bread and poured wine were his broken body and

ſhed

ſhed blood could really make them ſo; becauſe his body and blood would then have *been broken and ſhed, and unbroken and unſhed*, at one and the ſame time. Nor will the common evaſion by having recourſe *to God's or our Savior's acknowledged power, of miraculouſly turning ſtones into bread; or water into blood or wine*, be of the leaſt ſervice in this caſe; for, unleſs, it could be made appear from the ſacred records, that blood and wine have been made of water, *before they were made at all*, all ſuch citations, were they ever ſo numerous, are to no manner of purpoſe; for the ſuppoſition here is this, that bread and wine were turned into our Savior's broken body, and ſhed blood, before his body was broken, or his blood ſhed, which is a ſuppoſition very widely different from bread being allowed capable of being turned into a body, and wine into blood; the latter is not denied, tho the former very juſtly may; for how ſtrangely inconſequent would this reaſoning be, bread may be turned into the broken body of ſuch a one, after his body has been broken, therefore it may be turned into his broken body, before his body has been broken: For, tho it ſhould be granted that bread may be turned into the body of ſuch a one, yet, if it be turned into *his* body, it muſt be turned not only into ſuch a body, but *into exactly the ſame*, elſe, every one will eaſily ſee, that it is not his body, into

which it is changed, but ſomething elſe. Tho therefore it ſhould be admitted, that the bread indeed might have been changed into the body of our Lord, yet it muſt not only have been ſuch a body, as his then was, *but exactly the ſame*, for that only was his body and no other: ſo that his body being not then broken, but whole; the bread, had it been changed into his body, muſt have been turned into *a whole*, and not into *a broken body*. So that the words of the inſtitution are evidently not to be underſtood in their moſt obvious ſenſe, or according to their literal acceptation; *the thing being in its own nature impoſſible, that bread and wine ſhould be changed into the broken body and ſhed blood of our bleſſed Savior, before his body was broken and his blood ſhed.*

Neither can it be ſuppoſed that our *bleſſed Savior* ſhould order his diſciples in theſe words to eat his body and drink his blood, *ſhortly to be broken and ſhed*, under the appearances of bread and wine, becauſe being then, when he ſpake theſe words, *in his body which was to be broken*, it is impoſſible in the nature of things, that the bread, which was then broken, ſhould be that body, becauſe *one and the ſame body cannot poſſibly fill divers places at one and the ſame time*, as will be proved by and by. Nor will the diſtinction, here generally recurred to, in the leaſt help us in this matter; *for*, *whatever*

whatever difference there may poſſibly be between the mortal and immortal body. Chriſt's body being then *mortal* muſt be conſidered as ſuch, and not as immortal, which is more than a ſufficient anſwer, (tho we had no other, to that ſtrange cavil) *that tho it be not poſſible to imagine, how a human body, when it is in its corruptible, mortal and natural manner of being, can be truly and really contained under the form of a wafer, yet, when this ſame body has put on its incorruptible, immortal and ſpiritual manner of being, there is not then that difficulty of apprehending it.* For, let it be ever ſo eaſy to apprehend, how a ſpiritual body may be contained in ſo little room, the difficulty will ſtill remain as to our apprehending how Chriſt's *mortal body* could be contained in it, which is really the caſe here, according to the interpretation of the *Romaniſts* themſelves, and to be accounted for.

Beſides, what reaſon have we to imagin, that even immortalized bodys ſhall not be circumſcribible and limited to one place at one time? their *immortalization* or *ſpiritualization* by no means makes them *infinite*, for then, we ſhould have as many infinite beings, that is to ſay, as many *Gods*, as there ſhall be immortalized bodys; it is not therefore ſufficient to ſay *that Chriſt's body being become in its qualitys like a ſpirit, and a ſpirit requiring no extenſion or greatneſs of place for its being*

being, ſo neither does a body when 'tis become ſpiritual, but the whole ſhould be proved: But not to inſiſt on the apparent falſhood of the aſſertion; that Chriſt's body was *then* become in quality like a ſpirit, if it be meant of the time when he inſtituted his ſupper, nor on the ſuppoſition of an immortaliz'd body's becoming in quality like a ſpirit (which yet may perhaps admit of diſpute.) I ſhall only take the liberty of denying, that ſpirits themſelves do not require extenſion or greatneſs of place to be in, which will at once, if true, ſufficiently deſtroy all this reaſoning.

I cannot poſſibly conceive, but that all *created beings* muſt have place to be in, to which they are ſo confined, as not to be capable of filling any other place at the ſame time. It is equally abſurd and difficult to me, to imagin that created ſpirits actually exiſt, without ſuppoſing ſome place abſolutely neceſſary for them to exiſt in; and to ſuppoſe them capable of being in two, nay in millions of millions of different places, at one and the ſame time; for there is no arguing from God to them in this caſe, becauſe God is infinite, *and he alone*; but created ſpirits are finite, circumſcribible, or capable of being ſaid to be here and not there, or there and not here; and ſo conſequently limited to place; and therefore the difficulty will ſtill remain in relation to a created ſpirit, or other thing in its manner of

of being like ſuch a ſpirit; becauſe ſuch a ſpirit, or other thing in its manner of being like it, has dependence on place and is limited by it; from whence this conſequence will naturally follow, that even *Chriſt's immortalized body* cannot be both in heaven and on the altar too, much leſs on hundreds of thouſands of altars, at one and the ſame time.

But ſeveral things have been offered by way of reply to what has been ſaid under this head; as firſt, *that, tho naturally, and according to the ordinary courſe of things, one body cannot fill, or be in two places at one and the ſame time; yet the power of God working in an extraordinary manner may effect it*, or cauſe one body to fill or be in two places at one and the ſame time. Tho, as no proof has been offered to ſupport this aſſertion, I might eaſily be excuſed the taking any farther notice of it; yet, becauſe I would not willingly leave the leaſt colour of an objection unanſwered, I ſhall give the reaſon, why, I imagin, that even the Almighty being himſelf cannot make one body fill or be in two places, at one and the ſame time; and that is this, the thing is in itſelf *abſolutely impoſſible*, which I prove thus. It is the nature, as I have before prov'd, of all created beings, ſpirits as well as bodies, to have place to be in, to which they are ſo confined as not to be capable of filling

any

any other place at the ſame time: during the inſtant any ſingle being fills one place, and is limited by it (as all created beings are by one place or other) it cannot poſſibly fill or be in another, beyond the extent of that place; for then it would be in another, and not in that place; becauſe being but *one*, and finite or limited, no ſooner does it move out of the place in which it is at preſent, but it will be limited, *h. e.* defin'd or circumſcrib'd, according to its nature, by another place, and not by the place from which it is moved, becauſe it is not in that place, but moved from it.

In ſhort, as the place from which the *being* moves, and that to which it moves, are not only different in themſelves, but with reſpect to that being alſo, and it may be defin'd or circumſcrib'd by either excluſive of the other; nothing can be more evident, than that as it is but *one*, it can but fill one of the places at one and the ſame time, and that, as it is defin'd or circumſcrib'd by one of the places, it is, by that very thing, as it is but *one*, juſtly ſuppoſed not to be in the other; becauſe each of the two different places being equally capable of containing this being excluſive of the other, one or other of the places muſt always be without it, as it is but one; at leaſt till it be enlarged, and ſo they become but one place, with reſpect to it.

Nor

Nor can any poſſible power whatſoever make the leaſt alteration in this caſe, but what can make one being to be *one and two at the ſame inſtant*, which, being a contradiction in terms, is abſolutely impoſſible; for, if it be but one, during the time of its being ſo, it cannot poſſibly be two, for then it would be equal to itſelf, and as big again as itſelf, at the ſame time, which every one will eaſily perceive to be altogether impoſſible; and hence the notion of a reproduction of the ſame being proves likewiſe a meer chimera, which has no foundation for its ſupport, as will more plainly appear by and by.

It is likewiſe farther urged, that *tho there is no determining how the body of our Lord in the euchariſt occupies place, yet 'tis conceiv'd, that, as the church teaches, it is whole in the entire conſecrated bread, and whole in every divided part thereof, ſeparated from the reſt, that it takes up place indefinitely, that is, without a correſpondence of its parts with thoſe of the place ſo taken, after the manner of a ſpirit, which being a ſimple ſubſtance excludes a coalition of parts, and conſequently does not occupy place after the manner of a body, which occupies place by reaſon of its extenſion, quantity and other dimenſions.* If by being after the manner of a ſpirit, no more is intended, than that our Savior's

body, is, ſince his reſurrection become a ſpiritual or ſpiritualized body. St *Paul* and we ſhall be all of a mind, with regard to raiſed bodies * ; but, if by that ambiguous phraſe, it be ſuppoſed, that our Savior's body is now diveſted of all the qualities belonging to a body, whether animal or ſpiritual, and is become a pure ſpirit, ſome proof may be reaſonably expected, in deference, at leaſt, to ſo great an Apoſtle. Beſides, our Savior's body at the inſtitution of this ordinance was certainly *mortal*, and ſo not become after the manner of a ſpirit, and conſequently muſt be conſidered and accounted for as ſuch, and not as immortal, as has been before obſerved. Nor is it a ſufficient reply to this, to brand the objection with impiety, *for ſuggeſting that of our Savior's to be a corruptible body, and ſo not capable of being contained under the form of a wafer*, and then to tell us, *that the natural dimenſions of a body*, viz. *depth*, *magnitude*, &c. *being the work of nature, are not concern'd in the reproduction of the body of our Lord in the hoſt, that being a ſupernatural action.*

For, what orthodox divines ever taught that our Savior's body, before his death, was not naturally corruptible ? However, if any ſhou'd have been ſo weak, as to think,

* 1 Cor. xv. 44.

or talk at ſuch a rate, his death was a ſufficient confutation of all ſuch reveries.

And tho he might not lie long enough in the grave to ſee corruption there, yet that no more proves the natural incorruptibility of his body, than the tranſlation of *Enoch* and *Elijah* will prove the natural incorruptibility of their bodies. *Beſides*, whether his body was corruptible or incorruptible, it's plain by all the accounts we have of it, that it had all the natural dimenſions of a corruptible body, and ſo, if it was reproduced, muſt be reproduced with thoſe dimenſions, which certainly were impoſſible to be contained under the form of a piece of broken bread, much leſs of a wafer. Nor is it any thing at all to the purpoſe, to ſay, *that the ſubſtance of bread is as much in a wafer as in a peck loaf.* That was never called in queſtion, that I know of, but ſurely we have reaſon to imagin, that the ſubſtance of a peck loaf is not ſo much in a wafer, as in a peck loaf †. In ſhort, the matter of fact is ſo extremely plain, that one would think there ſhould be no manner of room for the leaſt diſpute in this caſe. The body of our bleſſed Savior, when he ſpake theſe words,

† *The Queſtion here is not whether part of our Savior's body, but whether the whole of it,* namely, *as it was to be broken, was in the bread.*

was ſo far from being after the manner of a ſpirit, that it was after the manner of our bodies, before death, and of the very ſame nature *. So that if his body was then reproduced, as is pretended, the very ſame *mortal, corruptible* body that his then was, muſt have been reproduced, otherwiſe it would not have been his body, that was reproduced, but ſomething different from it, of larger or leſſer dimenſions.

And, if a body of ſuch dimenſions had been reproduced, one may ſurely ſay, that a piece of broken bread, or a thin wafer, would never have contained it, without juſtly incurring the odious imputation of impiety. To clear up this part of the argument therefore, *that the body of our Lord in the euchariſt takes up place indefinitely, after the manner of a ſpirit*, it ſhould be proved, *either*, that our Savior was not in the body, when he ſpake theſe words; *or*, that tho he was in the body, yet his body was after the *manner of a ſpirit*; *or*, that tho his body was like that of other men, and not after the manner of a ſpirit, yet it might be reproduced and be in the bread after the manner of a ſpirit, *and yet be his body which was not after the manner of a ſpirit*; for, if he was in the body, and his body was not after the manner of a *ſpirit*,

* Rom. i. 3. Heb. ii. 14, 16, 17.

and

and that body of his, which was not after the *manner of a ſpirit*, could not be reproduced, and be in the bread or wafer after the manner of a ſpirit, and yet be his body which was not after the *manner of a ſpirit*, the body of our Lord in the euchariſt could not take up place indefinitely after the manner of a ſpirit: it had been time enough therefore to conſider the poſſibility of Chriſt's body being in two or more places at one and the ſame time, in conſequence of its being ſuppoſed to be in the bread after the manner of a ſpirit, when ſome of theſe had been ſufficiently proved; however, I ſhall by and by have an opportunity of ſtill farther conſidering the impoſſibility of even *created ſpirits* themſelves being in more than one place at one time; but ſhall at preſent take notice of ſomething that has been offered reſpecting the change or reproduction here contended for.

We are told, *that if it be urg'd that in the conſecrated hoſt, the colour, weight, quantity and ſhape*, (to which we may likewiſe add taſte) *of bread ſtill remain, it is agreed they do, but not inherent, as they were before in the unconſecrated bread, the ſubſtance whereof being transform'd into the fleſh of Chriſt, they ſubſiſt without any inheſion in it, becauſe, this being of an higher rank and order, and there produced by extraordinary and ſupernatu-*

ral

ral means, it excludes any union or conjunction with them; nature her ſelf being aſtoniſh'd and as it were at a ſtand, which otherwiſe, in her own uſual way produces the ſaid accidents dependent on matter to ſupport them. This, it muſt be allow'd, is an extraordinary puſh to carry a cauſe, and enough to puzzle the moſt penetrating genius, but falls vaſtly ſhort of giving any reaſonable ſatisfaction to the leaſt thoughtful perſon; for, who, not already diſpoſed to take a meer *ipſe dixit* for ſufficient proof, will think himſelf obliged to believe, that accidents ſubſiſt without inheſion, on the reaſon here aſſigned? Can it be imagined, that the Tranſubſtantiation *in diſpute* will be a ſufficient proof to a *Proteſtant*, who by his profeſſion denys it, that the colour, weight, quantity and ſhape of bread ſtill remain, when the bread itſelf is entirely gone? The medium here pitched on, as much wants proof, as the poſition for the proof whereof it is brought. Would but the *Romaniſts* be ſo kind as to tell us, what they mean, by accidents ſubſiſting without inheſion, that is to ſay, how they do ſubſiſt, they might have a chance to gain belief, as we happen'd to like the change; but, to pretend to tell us, that accidents ſubſiſt without inheſion, without letting us know how they do ſubſiſt, is at beſt but a dark ſtory and not fit to be told to any but

thoſe,

thoſe, who are always ready to believe as the church believes.

Again, we are farther told, *that, abſtracting from the manner that great change is wrought in, whereof we can have no clear or juſt idea, it is very probable, that God who produced the world out of nothing might bring to paſs in an inſtant, what nature her ſelf does in the courſe of four and twenty hours or thereabouts*, and that is, *to turn bread and wine into living fleſh and blood; and that they muſt have but a very imperfect notion of the extent of his power, who are otherwiſe minded, becauſe they dare not but own the creation aforeſaid to be his work, which as to difficulty, infinitely almoſt exceeds the other.* That there is a greater difficulty in creating an *ens* out of *non ens*, than in reproducing the ſame body (which muſt be the ſuppoſition here, and not a bare turning of bread and wine into living fleſh and blood, which no body will deny, but God may do) is not I think to be admitted; for nothing ſeems more evident, than that there can be no oppoſition to the creation of an *ens*, out of *non ens*, whereas the *ens* or *being* it ſelf will be an eternal hindrance to any reproduction of itſelf: For, if any thing be taken from it, it immediately ceaſes to be the *ens* it was, and ſo cannot be reproduced as ſuch, as it muſt want ſo much

of

of being that *ens*, as was taken from it; and if nothing be taken from it, there may be a creation or production indeed of ſomething, but not a reproduction of that ſame *ens*; becauſe there is nothing of that *ens* in the created or produced being, much leſs the whole of it contained in it.

It is likewiſe thought *a very bold thing to aſſert even Chriſt's immortalized body to be circumſcribible and limited to one place at one time*; but, if all created beings, even ſpirits themſelves are finite and conſequently limited to place (which I think has been ſufficiently proved) then, either Chriſt's body was not a *created being*, or elſe it is limited to place. But the ſcriptures plainly repreſent Chriſt as made of a woman and taking upon him our nature *. Neither will the dilemma of being oblig'd to ſuppoſe, either that ſome *created beings* are *infinite*, or that Chriſt's body was not a *created* or *made being*, be avoided, by telling us *that St.* John *expreſly has it twice in his twentieth chapter, that Chriſt, after his reſurrection, the apoſtles being together in an apartment locked, appear'd in the midſt of them.* For, allowing the doors to have been lock'd, which yet is far from being ſelf evident from the paſſages here referred to; could not the Apoſtles have

* Gal. iv. 4. Heb. ii. 14, 16, 17.

eaſily unlocked them, when ever any perſons came, whom they had a mind to admit? And, as the diſciples have taken no notice of this miracle to *Thomas*, when they told him, that they had ſeen the Lord, this may ſeem a conſiderable circumſtance to ſome to induce them to imagin that there was nothing miraculous in this his appearing to them: It has, I confeſs, much more appearance of argument in it, to me, on that ſide of the queſtion, than all the hard charges of ſuch a ſuppoſition's *being worſe than heatheniſh, novel and impious*, (which is all the proof of its falſeneſs which has yet been pretended to) have to recommend the contrary ſuppoſition. But admit, our Savior had come in, the doors being locked, what inference can be hence naturally drawn? why, that the body of our Savior, after his reſurrection, was ſpiritualiz'd, or render'd capable of entring into a room, the doors being locked: But, does this in the leaſt prove, either that *that body* was in, or capable of being in, another place at the ſame time? much leſs does it prove, that *his mortal, corruptible body* was capable of any ſuch thing.

Nor is what is farther advanced againſt my arguing, *that if the immortalization or ſpiritualization of bodies made them infinite, we ſhould then have as many infinite beings, that is to ſay as many Gods*

as there ſhall be immortalized bodies, namely, *that this is a very odd reaſoning of any one tho meanly inſtructed in the principles of chriſtianity, which teaches the Father, Son and holy Ghoſt, tho diſtinct in perſon, yet by reaſon of the divine nature in them, to be one God only, and that ſo in the caſe, before us, admitting the body of Chriſt in the euchariſt to be in many places at once, yet in regard, it is ſtill the ſame Chriſt our Redeemer in all and each of them, it is but a lame conſequence to make a plurality of Gods or Redeemers at the ſame time*, any more to the purpoſe. Were mankind indeed as univerſally agreed in allowing infinity and indiviſibility to matter, as to the divine being, there might be ſome room to expect an excuſe for ſuch a confuſion of ideas.

But, tho the Godhead, which is *infinite* and *indiviſible*, ſhould be applied to two, or three, or more ſeveral perſons in ſeveral places, does it therefore follow, that the ſame body, which is *finite* and *entirely confined to one particular perſon or thing, as well as place*, can be in two or three millions of places at one and the ſame time? Whether it be a lame conſequence to infer the circumſcribibility or limitation of bodies to one particular place at one time, from their being finite, I willingly leave to all mankind to judge; but muſt ſay this, that

if

if it be not a lame conſequence, to infer the ubiquity of bodies from the ubiquity of the Godhead, I know not what *lame* and *conſequence* mean.

I now proceed to conſider, what has been offered with regard to what I have advanced concerning the impoſſibility of even created ſpirits themſelves being in more than one place at one time. It has been urged, *that to ſay ſpirits require extenſion or greatneſs of place to be in, is to admit a compoſition of parts in them, which would exclude the eſſential difference between matter and ſpirit, the former in its own nature being diviſible into parts and the other not.* The juſtneſs of this inference, I profeſs I cannot perceive; for tho the indiviſibility of ſpirits be allowed, it has never been proved, that I know of, that a *created, indiviſible, ſpiritual ſubſtance* or being does not occupy place; for, to ſay, that it does not occupy place, after the manner of a body, is only to tell us, that it is ſomething different from what we call body, which is eaſily granted, but is far from proving that it does not occupy place at all, nor is limited by it. Neither is the inſtance *of many Devils in one Man* any more to the purpoſe; for I never denyed that ſpirits can penetrate bodys, but this I deny, that any created ſpirits are infinite and not limited to one place at one time. If indeed it had been

proved that *thoſe Devils* were elſewhere or every where at the ſame time they were in the man, I ſhould have had reaſon to retract my ſuppoſition, *that even created ſpirits themſelves require place to exiſt in*, but all, that has been ſaid on this head, only amounts to this, that ſpirits require very little ſpace to exiſt in, which I never contradicted, that I remember, and ſo my reaſoning under that part of the argument ſtill ſtands good.

But as *the ſame body cannot poſſibly fill divers places at one and the ſame time*, and therefore the change or reproduction here contended for, by the *Romaniſts*, could never poſſibly take place, ſo

In *the 2d place*, Four of our five ſenſes, which four *only* are capable of giving judgment in this caſe, without heſitation tell us, that the bread and wine, even after conſecration remain ſtill the ſame, and are the ſubjects of the very ſame propertys and qualitys as they were before. Nor are the inſtances of *Mary Magdalen's being deceiv'd in ſuppoſing that ſhe ſaw a young man ſitting at the right ſide of the grave, whereas it prov'd to be an angel, in the likeneſs of a young man*; nor *of the dove ſeen over Chriſt at his baptiſm*, nor *of the fiery tongues over the apoſtles at pentecoſt, under which forms the Holy Ghoſt appeared at thoſe ſeveral times*, ſufficient to make

us

us diſtruſtful of our ſenſes in this or the like caſes. Inſtead of bringing us inſtances purely relating to the ſight, which all acknowledge to be eaſily capable of being deceived, by reaſon of falſe mediums, or thro' the diſtance of objects, ſome inſtances ſhould be brought, wherein all the four ſenſes of *feeling, taſting, ſmelling and ſeeing*, are daily deceived; and thoſe inſtances too ſhould be in ſuch things as we are as familiarly acquainted with, as with the colour, touch, taſte and ſmell of bread and wine; then indeed there might be ſome room for objecting to us an inconſiſtency, in not being equally diffident of theſe our ſenſes in like caſes; but, to ſuppoſe, that becauſe we may be deceived in the objects of ſight, and the mixtures of ſtones, metals and drugs, all which things are far from being familiar to us, we may therefore ſafely conclude, that we are not ſufficiently capable of diſcerning between the touch, taſte and ſmell of *bread and fleſh*, or *of wine and blood*, all which things are exceedingly familiar to us and perfectly well known by us, is a ſort of reaſoning, which one would think ſhould ſcarcely ever prevail with any, but thoſe, who are willing to be deceived.

Neither is there any compariſon between *making one ſort of meat eat like another*, by the helps of many ingredients, and *turning bread into a body of fleſh, and then making*

making that body of fleſh eat like bread; the *firſt* is made up of many ingredients naturally tending to produce the colour, taſte, *&c.* of the imitated meat, meat it ſelf being the baſis of the compoſition; ſo that it's no deception or wonder at all to thoſe who are acquainted with the compoſition, that ſuch a colour, taſte, *&c.* are the reſult thereof: But has fleſh and blood, from which *alone* (if we may believe the *Romaniſts*) reſults the taſte of the wafer, naturally the leaſt reſemblance of any ſuch taſte? if not, ſuch inſtances were they ever ſo common, are all foreign to the purpoſe.

Could *daily inſtances* in *various nations* of *pure beef or mutton*, of the colour, touch, taſte and ſmell of veniſon be produced, we ſhould then ſee, that things different in nature may produce the ſame colour, touch, taſte and ſmell, as is here pretended, and that ſuch an univerſal deception, as is here contended for, is not impoſſible: But, till that be done, I can ſee no reaſon the *Romaniſts* have to complain, tho we ſtill imagin, that the taſte of the wafer, being exactly the ſame *after conſecration* that it was before, does therefore rather reſult from the wafer itſelf, than from the body of Chriſt. The ſame may likewiſe be ſaid with regard to the wine.

Nor

Nor can the plauſible pretence of extraordinary deference to the declarations of the word of God, where it is written *this is my body which is broken for you* and *my blood which is ſhed for you*, (ſo frequently urged by our opponents) be of any weight with thoſe, who are at all acquainted with their unaccountable treatment of it in other caſes: The ſame divine word plainly aſſures us, in the very ſame ſentence, that it was *broken bread*, which, according to *our interpretation*, repreſented our Savior's body, which was ſhortly to be broken, *or*, which, *according to them*, at leaſt, became his body, which was ſhortly to be broken; and we read of nothing *but wine* made uſe of to repreſent his blood; whereas they have boldly ſubſtituted *a whole wafer* in the room of the former, and have unwarrantably added *water* to the latter: now if they may take the liberty of ſuppoſing their *whole* wafer, to be the broken bread, and their wine and water to be the wine intended by our Savior, without any rule, example or the leaſt neceſſity of ſuch an interpretation; why ſhould it be ſuppoſed criminal in us, to put ſuch a ſenſe upon the words, as they can only bear, with any tolerable propriety, and ſuch a ſenſe, as (I think it's very evident from the context and ſhall be ſhewn by and by) our Savior only intended; why, I ſay ſhould it be reckoned criminal

minal in us, to ſuppoſe the words figuratively ſpoken; and to ſignify no more, than that the broken bread and poured wine were to be the commemorative ſigns or repreſentations of the broken body and ſhed blood of our dear Redeemer? and eſpecially, as it muſt be allowed, that we have ſeveral inſtances of the like kind of phraſeology in the ſacred writings, and *eſpecially* in ſacramental caſes. Thus, before *Abraham* was circumciſed, *this is my covenant*, (ſays God of circumciſion) *between me and thee* *. So likewiſe, before God had actually paſſed over the houſes of the *Iſraelites*, and ſmitten the *Egyptians*, it is ſaid of the paſchal lamb, *this is the Lord's paſſover* †, in both which inſtances, we have ſomething conſiderably uſeful to the right underſtanding of the like expreſſions in the inſtitution of the Lord's ſupper. For,

Firſt, As the *broken bread and poured wine* at the Lord's ſupper are called his *broken body and ſhed blood*; *ſo circumciſion* is, in the text before cited, as expreſly called *God's covenant* and *the paſchal lamb the Lord's paſſover*: Now as none, I ſuppoſe, will hence pretend to plead that circumciſion is actually God's covenant; or the paſchal lamb actually God's paſſover, but on the other hand all agree, that circumciſion was

* Gen. xvii. 4, 10, 23, 26. compared.

† Exod. xii. 11.

only

only to be a ſign of God's covenant with *Abraham*, and his poſterity; and the paſchal lamb to be *only* a commemorative ſign or repreſentation of God's paſſing over the houſes of the children of *Iſrael*, when at the ſame time he ſmote all the firſt-born of the land of *Egypt*; one would think there ſhould be no difficulty of allowing the like liberty of interpretation of our Savior's words in diſpute; for, his ſaying of the bread and wine, this is my body, which is broken for you and my blood which is ſhed for you, *could no more neceſſitate thoſe things to be ſo*; than God's ſaying of circumciſion and the paſchal lamb, that they were his covenant and his paſſover could cauſe them to be ſo: For, it will certainly hold good, that as circumciſion was not God's covenant with *Abraham*, *this* * having been made before *that* was inſtituted, but a ſign thereof, and as the paſchal lamb was in reality, as well as always accounted a different thing from the Lord's paſſing over the houſes of the children of *Iſrael*, being univerſally received as only a ſign thereof, at the ſame time theſe things are ſo ſtrongly affirmed of them by God himſelf; ſo the bread and wine in the Lord's ſupper, *certainly may*, after the ſame manner of ſpeak-

* Gen. xii. 2.

ing, not be our Savior's body and blood, but only a commemorative ſign or repeſentation thereof; nay, for the reaſons before aſſigned certainly cannot, notwithſtanding his plain affirmation thereof. And, that our ſenſe of the words is that wherein our bleſſed Savior ſpake them, is abundantly evident, from what he immediately adds, both with reſpect to the bread and the wine; *this do in remembrance of me*; which one would think abundantly ſufficient to prevent all imaginable cavils on this head: For, who can ſuppoſe that any reaſonable perſon would injoin another to eat his body and drink his blood in remembrance of himſelf? the very thinking, writing, or talking about it is diſguſtful and nauſeous, what then muſt the thing itſelf be? And ſhall we be guilty of imputing ſuch a piece of inhumanity to the bleſſed Jeſus, as would be abhorred by the very weakeſt of our ſpecies?

Beſides, our aſſerting, that the broken bread and poured wine, at the inſtitution of the Lord's ſupper, could not poſſibly be the broken body and ſhed blood of our dear Redeemer, ſtands upon an *equal footing* with this aſſertion, that the paſchal lamb, at the firſt inſtitution of the paſſover, could not poſſibly be the Lord's paſſover; for if it be true, that *that* lamb could not poſſibly be the

the Lord's paſſover, nor was intended to be ſo affirmed by the expreſſion, becauſe the Lord had not yet paſſed over the houſes of the children of *Iſrael*; ſo, one would think, it ſhould as readily be allowed, that the broken bread and poured wine in the Lord's ſupper, at its firſt inſtitution, *when he was yet alive*, could not poſſibly be his broken body and ſhed blood, becauſe his body had not yet been broken nor his blood ſhed: but as the former was to be a *ſign* of the enſuing paſſover, ſo the latter was only to be a *token* or *ſign* of the enſuing ſufferings of our dear Redeemer, and not his broken body or ſhed blood themſelves, becauſe his body had not yet been broken nor his blood ſhed.

But, to theſe arguments drawn from circumciſion and the paſchal lamb, it is replied, *that the parity is lame, for in this caſe, there are only bare words relating things to be done, that is, circumciſion and the paſſover; in the other, beſides words there are viſible things, namely bread and wine.* But whether the circumciſed foreskin and the paſchal lamb were not viſible things, all mankind will eaſily judge; if they were, then there were viſible things in the former, as well as in the latter caſe, and ſo the parity is good.

And, indeed, as to ſcripture expreſſions, it is almoſt impoſſible for any, who are but

tolerably acquainted with thoſe writings, not to have obſerved, that many of them are not to be taken in the literal ſenſe, but are to be conſidered as peculiar to thoſe languages in which they were ſpoken or written, *or* to thoſe philoſophical ſyſtems, which then prevailed; as for inſtance, who was ever ſo weak as to pretend to believe, that our Savior was a *door*, *vine*, *or the like*, notwithſtanding all his affirmations thereof? theſe and the like expreſſions are always accounted figurative and interpreted accordingly. Why then ſhould not the ſame liberty be eaſily allowed in the caſe before us, and *eſpecially* as our Savior himſelf has plainly directed us to ſuch an interpretation, by immediately adding with regard both to the bread and wine, *this do in remembrance of me?* ſo that the objection of the *Romaniſts*, *that we chooſe to believe our ſenſes*, *rather than the word of God*, *in the caſe before us*, is meer trifling; becauſe, we believe the word of God in this and all other caſes, in that ſenſe wherein we think it was ſpoken, and they, we preſume, pretend to believe it in no other, but that wherein they ſuppoſe it was ſpoken, ſo that we are here exactly upon a level.

The bringing *Chriſt's entring in among his diſciples*, *the doors being ſhut*; *his being born without injury to his mother's virginal*

virginal integrity, and *his paſſing thro' the multitudes more than once or twice* (*without being ſeized, when ſome had a mind to apprehend him*) to ſupport his præternatural and ſpiritual manner of exiſtence, not only after his reſurrection but before, ſufficiently ſhews the weakneſs of the cauſe to be defended by them, which would never take up with theſe, but for want of more appoſite inſtances.

As for the firſt, I have already ſhewn, that unleſs we love to have miracles, we have no occaſion to ſuppoſe one here.

Neither *is our Savior's being born without injury to his mother's virginal integrity* (*as they chooſe to expreſs it*) at all to the purpoſe; becauſe, tho he was miraculouſly conceiv'd by the Holy Ghoſt, yet no body, *now*, I believe, imagines, that he was a ſpiritual, but a fleſhly ſubſtance, after the manner of all other fœtus's in the womb; otherwiſe, how did he take upon him our nature?

And, as for *his paſſing thro' the multitudes unobſerved, ſo as to eſcape being ſeized*, it may very eaſily, I think, be accounted for, without having recourſe to miracles, or ſuppoſing him to aſſume a præternatural and ſpiritual manner of exiſtence. For, how many *notorious malefactors*, who had made all the world as it were their enemies,

mies, have ſtrangely eſcaped the hands of juſtice, tho' ſtrongly environ'd with prodidious multitudes of crouding ſpectators? Why then may we not reaſonably ſuppoſe that our *bleſſed Savior, who never did any man harm, but went about doing good*, (and ſo muſt have a conſiderable number of friends) might eaſily make his eſcape out of the croud once or twice, when neceſſity oblig'd him ſo to do for his own preſervation? At leaſt how ſhall we hook in miracles or a præternatural manner of exiſtence in his caſe, without being obliged to grant a much greater neceſſity of allowing the ſame in the forementioned inſtances?

Beſides, our bleſſed Savior, according to the *Romiſh* interpretation of theſe words, muſt at leaſt have been under *two different forms*, and in *two different places*, if not have *exiſted bodily and ſpiritually* at the ſame time, at the inſtitution, I mean, of his ſupper; which I deny any created or made being, as our Savior's body certainly was, how ſpiritualized ſoever it may poſſibly be, to be capable of.

Having thus finiſhed what I had to offer by way of argument on this ſubject, it may not be amiſs to obſerve in a few words, how thoſe of the *Romiſh* communion, endeavour to impoſe upon unwary readers in the affair of the *fathers*. Becauſe ſome of the primitive

tive chriſtians made no ſcruple of calling the ſacrament of the Lord's ſupper, *a ſacrifice, an oblation, the body and blood of the Lord, and the like*; they would make thoſe, who know no better, ſuppoſe, that thoſe chriſtians really believ'd that the bread and wine were actually changed into the body and blood of Chriſt, whereas nothing can be more falſe, the generality of the *fathers*, even of the fourth and fifth centuries, expreſly teaching, that the bread and wine in the Lord's ſupper, were only figures of the body and blood of Chriſt; ſo that ſuch expreſſions, were the authority of the *fathers* to decide the preſent controverſy, would be of no manner of advantage to the *Romaniſts*, becauſe thoſe who uſed them, have plainly ſhewn us, that they uſed them in a quite different ſenſe from that wherein the *Romaniſts* underſtand them; nay in the very ſame ſenſe, in which we *Proteſtants* take them.

To conclude; Chriſt's body, when he inſtituted his ſupper, was, I affirm, *not ſpiritualized*, and ſo could not be in the bread after the manner of a ſpirit, and even now that it is *ſpiritualized*, yet, as it is a *created being*, it is, I conceive, finite or limited by place, and ſo cannot be in two or more places at one and the ſame time. If any, who are contrariwiſe minded, think fit to deny one or both theſe plain aſſertions

tions and to diſprove my reaſoning on them, they may expect to hear farther from me; till then I leave it, juſt as it is, to the impartial cenſure of every honeſt mind.

FINIS.

Publiſhed by the ſame Author.

REflections on Dr. *Wright*'s Treatiſe on the Religious Obſervation of the Lord's Day, according to the expreſs words of the fourth Commandment, ſhewing the Inconcluſiveneſs of the Doctor's reaſoning on that Subject, and the Impoſſibility of grounding the firſt day Sabbath on the fourth Commandment, or any other Text of Scripture produced by him for that purpoſe; in a Letter to the Doctor.